

Congressman Doug Lamborn

CPAC Speech – Denver

October 4, 2012

Didn't Governor Romney have a great debate last night? I think he hit a home run! Barack Obama doesn't do so well without a teleprompter.

It's an honor to be among so many great conservatives, and I don't just mean the excellent roster of other speakers. I mean you conservatives who have gathered here today, and who realize that the future of our nation hangs in the balance on November 6. It is you who will bring us victory over liberalism here in the Rocky Mountain West.

I want to thank the American Conservative Union for making this country a better place, and for putting on this great event. By the way, I'm honored to be one of just a handful of House veterans with a lifetime 100 percent ranking from ACU, so I wouldn't dream of complaining.

There are eerie parallels between this year's election and 1980, the last time an incumbent Democrat President was so threatened. Let me draw some of them for you.

Jimmy Carter was widely viewed as having failed on both the domestic front, with raging inflation and energy shortages, and on the foreign front, with the Soviet Union literally on the march in Afghanistan, and with Americans held hostage in our own embassy in Tehran.

Jimmy Carter had just come off a mid-term election in 1978 that was bad for him, losing 11 seats in the House and 3 in the Senate.

Americans don't like Presidents who talk mainstream to get elected, and then govern from the far left. Sounds like Barack Obama, doesn't it?

Before Ambassador Christopher Stevens was brutally killed in Libya on September 11, I'll give you one guess as to who was President the last time a U.S. ambassador was murdered? You're right, Jimmy Carter.

Our intelligence services knew within hours of the tragic murder in Benghazi that terrorists were involved. After all, it was not only 9/11, but do street mobs bring along automatic weapons and rocket propelled grenades?

Yet, the administration line was that this was a spontaneous response to a silly video on YouTube that had been out there for months. This is what U.N. Ambassador Susan Rice was still saying five days after the murder. By the way, I join with Chairman Peter King in demanding that she resign!

Not only does it look like Hillary Clinton had pathetically weak rules of engagement, prohibiting our Marines from providing security, but maybe even not allowing local security to use bullets.

Even worse, President Obama's policy of appeasement and apologizing for America only emboldens the terrorists, and this administration doesn't want Americans to be reminded of that before the election.

Why is Obama's failed approach so bad? Because if our Commander in Chief can't even face up to the true nature of the threat against us, how in the world can he defend us from it?

It's not like this is the first time this administration has refused to label terrorism as terrorism. To this day, the Fort Hood massacre has not been labeled as terrorism.

I could go on and on about the President's failures in national security—telling the Russians over an open mic that he'd have more flexibility after the election; throwing our European allies under the bus by cancelling missile defense plans; signing a nuclear treaty that lets the Russians add nuclear weapons while we have to destroy some of ours, and then leaking plans to make even deeper unilateral cuts in our nuclear arsenal; attempting to close Guantanamo Bay and send the most dangerous terrorists to civilian courts and prisons, with all the Constitutional rights liberal judges would give them; and most dangerous of all, the looming sequestration budget cuts that will, as even the administration's own Secretary of Defense says, be like shooting ourselves, not in the foot, but in the head.

In contrast to the President, Mitt Romney would restore defense spending and capabilities, be tougher with Iran, and not hang key allies like Israel out to dry. It would be a night and day difference from Barack Obama, who views American strength as dangerous rather than a force for good. Romney gets it.

Barack Obama and Jimmy Carter have a lot in common domestically, as well. Look at the crummy economy. Remember the question Ronald Reagan asked while campaigning—"Are you better off now than four years ago?"

Here in Colorado, a battleground state, unemployment is now above the national average for the first time in nearly seven years. In my own district, Colorado Springs has seen unemployment go up for five straight months, to almost ten per cent.

Who in their right mind thinks that they're better off now than four years ago? And how in the world can any rational person think that four more years of the same will produce a different result?

This is why Barack Obama, like Jimmy Carter before him, is trying to divert attention from his sorry record by painting his opponent as an out-of-touch extremist.

When it comes to energy, the parallels between Obama and Carter are also striking. Some of you will remember in the Seventies when you could only buy gasoline on certain days of the week depending on whether your license plate ended in an odd or an even number. Well, under Barack Obama gasoline prices have more than doubled from when he took office. Although gas can be had today, the high price lowers the standard of living for working families.

While the President and his subordinates claim that energy production is up, they disingenuously omit to say that while energy production on private lands is up, on public lands, where they call the shots, it is down.

Whenever push comes to shove, this administration puts environmentalist demands over jobs and a better economy.

That's why he vetoed the Keystone Pipeline.

That's why there's a War on Coal, using regulations that claim to be for reducing mercury, or controlling fly ash, or cleaning streams, but are actually intended to shut down coal.

That's why here in the Rocky Mountain West it takes much longer to get a permit to drill on public lands than ever before.

That's why we've gone deeper into debt to fund green energy fiascos like Solyndra.

And that's why a dozen federal agencies are trying to regulate hydraulic fracking. There's no legitimate environmental threat from fracking, states are already doing an excellent job of regulating it on

their own, and the resulting abundance of natural gas is about the only bright spot in the economy. But environmentalists hate hydrocarbons with a passion, and Barack Obama puts their desires over the needs of working Americans.

In stark contrast, the Romney/Ryan energy plan will build our economy directly, by creating high-paying energy jobs; will create jobs indirectly, by making low-cost energy available to industry; and will make Americans more prosperous by making their dollars go further.

Romney and Ryan won't speak out of both sides of their mouths, like this administration does, promising to use domestic energy but throwing up roadblocks at every turn. You wouldn't know it from the price of gas at the pump, or the shutting down of perfectly fine coal-fired electric plants, or the anemic rate of permitting for offshore oil platforms, but the U.S. has more BTU's, more energy, waiting underground than any other country in the world. Obama doesn't get it, but Romney does.

Here's the most critical parallel between today and 1980. Even though the press did everything they could to prop up Jimmy Carter, and liberals reviled Ronald Reagan, conservatism prevailed. As late as October 26, Reagan trailed Carter in the polls by 8 percentage points, yet he won by 10 percentage points.

The die is not yet cast. History is not yet written. This election is very much in our hands.

You know, it took a Jimmy Carter to give us Ronald Reagan. I truly believe that Mitt Romney has the same opportunity and potential to turn our country around, with the help of Republicans in the House and Senate who are much more conservative than in 1980.

I am especially excited by Mitt Romney's choice of Paul Ryan for Vice-President. I know Paul personally, and he's been willing and able to push Republican leadership into a more conservative stance time and time again. He's done this by the force of his conservative beliefs.

When Reagan was elected in 1980 his Vice-President was George H.W. Bush, a good and decent man, but not the conservative spokesman that Paul Ryan will be. In this way, history may be kinder to us than in 1980.

And history may again repeat itself—except that instead of one of the worst Presidents in our nation's history being defeated for reelection, it will be the worst President in our nation's history being defeated for reelection!

Thank you and God bless America!